



1999

Caddoan Ceremonial Sites of the Caddoan Cultural Area of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas: Draft Caddo National Landmark Nomination

Mark R. Barnes
National Park Service

Timothy K. Perttula
Center for Regional Heritage Research, Stephen F. Austin State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ita>



Part of the [American Material Culture Commons](#), [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), [Other American Studies Commons](#), [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Other History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

[Tell us](#) how this article helped you.

Repository Citation

Barnes, Mark R. and Perttula, Timothy K. (1999) "Caddoan Ceremonial Sites of the Caddoan Cultural Area of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas: Draft Caddo National Landmark Nomination," *Index of Texas Archaeology: Open Access Gray Literature from the Lone Star State*: Vol. 1999 , Article 22.

<https://doi.org/10.21112/.ita.1999.1.22>

ISSN: 2475-9333

Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ita/vol1999/iss1/22>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Index of Texas Archaeology: Open Access Gray Literature from the Lone Star State by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu.

Caddoan Ceremonial Sites of the Caddoan Cultural Area of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas: Draft Caddo National Landmark Nomination

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

***CADDOAN CEREMONIAL SITES OF THE
CADDOAN CULTURAL AREA OF ARKANSAS,
LOUISIANA, OKLAHOMA, AND TEXAS:
DRAFT CADDO NATIONAL HISTORIC
LANDMARK NOMINATION***

by

Mark R. Barnes, Ph.D., National Park Service*

and

Timothy K. Perttula, Ph.D., Archeological & Environmental Consultants*¹

INTRODUCTION

Since 1997, we have been working on the development of a National Historic Landmark (NHL) cover nomination for Caddoan ceremonial sites – earthen mounds – in the Caddoan cultural area of southwestern Arkansas, northwestern Louisiana, eastern Oklahoma, and north-eastern Texas. Such a nomination establishes the historic context within which all similar cultural properties can be evaluated for significance according to the NHL criteria, as it establishes the research and other criteria by which a cultural property may be identified as a significant archeological resource.

The NHL nomination of Caddoan ceremonial sites is an important step in a long-range process to preserve these nationally significant properties. The nomination of Caddoan ceremonial sites to the NHL clearly points to the recognized significance and importance of the sites, and highlights the need to protect them while properly documenting their archeological character.

We are soliciting the help of the Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma, professional archeologists (government, academia, and private consultants), avocational archeologists,

* For author information, see “The Authors”, p. 4.

and other interested members of the public in the completion of this NHL nomination project. We would appreciate receiving any substantive comments on the NHL cover nomination being published in this

issue of *Caddoan Archeology*, and also solicit participation of individuals interested in developing individual site nominations to accompany the cover NHL nomination.

STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Archeological work has shown that the distribution of Caddoan ceremonial mound sites is limited to the Red, Ouachita, and Arkansas River Basins in southwest Arkansas, northcentral and northwest Louisiana, eastern Oklahoma, and northeastern Texas. Construction of ceremonial mound centers by Caddoan peoples found in the Caddoan Culture Area commenced ca. A.D. 800. Over the next nine hundred years these mound centers became increasingly larger and more complex, under the apparent direction of a Caddoan chiefdom elite. During the sixteenth century, the effects of pandemic diseases caused a substantial loss of population and the gradual cessation of ceremonial mound construction. By ca. A.D. 1700 all Caddoan ceremonial mound centers were abandoned.

Prior to the emergence of a distinctive Caddo culture ca. A.D. 800, these areas were occupied by Woodland and Fourche Maline groups that were ancestral to the Caddoan peoples. According to Pertulla (1992:13), in *"The Caddo Nation"*:

The actual processes involved in the appearance and development of the prehistoric Caddoan cultural

tradition are still a matter of some debate, but generally speaking the most important factors appear to be: (a) the development of more complex social and political systems of authority, ritual, and ceremony; (b) the rise, elaboration, and maintenance of social ranking and status within the Caddoan communities and larger social and political spheres; and (c) the intensification of maize agriculture and a reliance on tropical cultigens over time in local economic systems.

Most Caddoan mound sites only have one mound, although some of the larger Caddoan sites contain multiple mounds. A distinctive feature of the mounds is their use as the foundations for ceremonial and elite residential structures. Mound excavations show they were also constructed in stages and served occasionally as the focus of tomb burials of Caddoan chiefs, often interred with elaborate burial goods and sometimes buried with human attendants.

Caddoan ceremonial mound centers were always the center of a large Caddo village or community, and on the larger rivers

were integral parts of Caddo towns. Past archeological work on these sites have tended to focus on investigation of the mounds and their contents due to the elaborate burial goods interred with the chiefs, although current research is now studying other aspects of Caddo culture. Current research on Caddo ceremonial

centers include topics such as: chronology and typology, settlement systems, subsistence systems, social and political complexity, demographic change, mortuary practices, local and extra-local trade and exchange, technological change, and material culture.

Background Narrative of the Culture History of the Caddoan Culture Area

Pre-Caddo Culture

Mound building in and near the Caddoan Culture Area dates back to the late Middle Archaic with the construction of Hedgepeth Mound, an Archaic Period structure, in Lincoln Parish, Louisiana, which has been dated to ca. 5000 - 4500 B.C. (Saunders and Allen 1994). A second period of mound dates from ca. 300 B.C. to A.D. 600, as seen in burial mounds built in southwest Arkansas, northwest Louisiana, and east Texas (Schambach 1996, 1997). The next mound building tradition occurred in the northcentral and northwest part of Louisiana until the Coles Creek culture, A.D. 700 - 1100 (a Late Woodland culture), which spread up the Red River valley from its area of origin in the Lower Mississippi Valley. The Coles Creek culture constructed mounds for the interment of the dead.

Around A.D. 800, cultures in the northwestern part of Louisiana appear to have developed independently of the Mississippian mound tradition into the Caddoan

mound tradition. The Caddoan Culture Area, while derived from the Southeastern mound building traditions of the eastern United States Woodland and Mississippian traditions found in the Lower Mississippi River Valley, is nonetheless differentiated from these cultures by ceramic types, elaborate religious ceremonialism, and the fact that the Caddo tribes have maintained much of their culture and language down to the present.

Within the central and northern area of the Caddoan Culture Area -- southwest Arkansas and southeast Oklahoma -- existed another pre-Caddo burial mound building culture called Fourche Maline. The Fourche Maline culture, dating from ca. 800 B.C. to ca. A.D. 900, is coeval with the Marksville and Troyville period burial mound building cultures of the Southeastern United States (Schambach 1998). The Fourche Maline culture was apparently located on the extreme western edge of the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere, and toward the end of its existence received cultural influences from the

Coles Creek culture to the south, until replaced by the Caddoan culture that introduced temple mounds into the area by ca. A.D. 1200, if not earlier.

Presently, the basic cultural chronology for the Caddoan Culture Area is divided into five periods (Caddo I - V) for the time frame of ca. A.D. 800 - 1850. Within each of the four state areas, the five periods have been differentiated into phases or smaller periods, based primarily on ceramic typology and radiocarbon dating. Most of the following chronology was developed by archeological research which has historically concentrated on the recovery of artifacts from high status burials, usually recovered from tomb burials located within mounds.

Caddo I Period

The development of the Caddo culture, beginning ca. A.D. 800, is currently not well understood. Today, the prevailing theory among researchers of prehistoric Caddoan archeology is that Caddoan societies evolved in place through a fusion of Coles Creek and Fourche Maline cultures of the Red River and Arkansas River valleys; some researchers also suggest that there were special religious concepts and features that have been possibly derived from Middle America, although this idea is not currently much in favor. The culture of Caddo I Period represents a continuation of the earlier burial mound building cultures in terms of mound building around a plaza. What was new was the use of certain ceramic types, use of the bow and arrow, maize agriculture, and sedentism. However, between ca.

A.D. 800 and A.D. 1000 it had become a distinct culture. According to the authors of *Louisiana's Comprehensive Archaeological Plan*:

What makes the Caddoan culture distinct from other contemporary cultures that succeeded the Coles Creek culture in the lower Mississippi valley (namely, the Plaquemine and Mississippian cultures) was the introduction of new cultural traits which were evidently derived from Middle America [Smith et al. 1983:211].

Particularly characteristic of the Caddo I Period are large shaft graves for high status individuals, sometimes accompanied by retainers; new ceramic shapes, such as bottles and carinated bowls, with a glossy black or dark brown exterior finish; new ceramic decoration techniques, such as engraving; and the appearance of new religious iconography involving a long-nosed god and the feathered serpent engraved on sheet copper, stone, and conch shells. These latter features are very similar to the religious art found in Middle America (Smith et al. 1983:212).

Arkansas

Lost Prairie and Miller's Crossing Phases, A.D. 900 - 1200)

These two phases are equivalent to the Caddo I Period for southwest Arkansas. During these phases, temple mounds, but without any constructions on their

summits, along with shaft tombs in the mounds, first make their appearance in this part of the Caddoan Culture Area. Ceramics associated with these phases are Crockett Curvilinear Incised, Pennington Punctated-Incised, Holly Fine Engraved, Spiro Engraved, Wilkinson Punctated, Hollyknowe Ridge-Pinched, Williams Plain, and LeFlore Plain. Significant sites of the Lost Prairie and Miller's Crossing phases, in Arkansas, are the Crenshaw and Bowman sites (Schambach and Early 1982:100-101).

Louisiana

Alto Focus (A.D. 800 - 1150)

The Alto Focus is equivalent to the Caddo I Period for northcentral and northwest Louisiana. This area of the Caddoan Culture Area is the first to construct flat-topped temple mounds arranged around central plazas, but mounds, besides serving as the bases for ceremonial structures, also contained shaft tombs where high status individuals were interred with elaborate ceremony and ceramic, stone, shell, and copper objects obtained through trading networks with the Mississippi valley to the east. Significant sites of the Alto Focus in Louisiana include the Gahagan site and Mounds Plantation (Smith et al. 1983:212-213).

Oklahoma

Harlan Phase (A.D. 1000 - 1250)

The Harlan phase is largely equivalent to the Caddo I and the early part of the Caddo II Period. The Harlan phase of the Caddo I Period starts later than Caddo I Period in Louisiana due to the apparent time lag involved in the spread of the Caddoan culture up the Red River and into

the Arkansas Basin of eastern Oklahoma. Key ceramic types for the Harlan Phase are Crockett Curvilinear Incised, Spiro Engraved, Williams Plain, and shell-tempered Woodward Plain. The Harlan site is the type site for this phase of the Oklahoma part of the Caddoan Culture Area. Other significant sites are Brackett, Eufaula, the Spiro village area, and Plantation site (Brown et al. 1978:172-173).

Texas

Formative Caddoan (A.D. 800 - 1000)

This period of time represents the earliest settlements of Caddo peoples in Northeast Texas, and archeological sites have broad affiliations with other Caddo groups of the Lost Prairie, Miller's Crossing, and Alto phases living on the Red River in the Great Bend area of southwest Arkansas and northwest Louisiana. Engraved ceramics include the types Hickory Fine Engraved, Holly Fine Engraved, and Spiro Engraved. More common utility wares are Weches Fingernail-Imprinted, Kiam Incised, Davis Incised, and Dunkin Incised, along with plain wares; Coles Creek Incised and other Coles Creek period ceramics are also present. During this period, Caddo peoples built and maintained flat-topped earthen mounds for the burial of elite individuals who had exotic ceramic, stone, shell, and copper objects as grave goods. Important ceremonial sites of the Formative Caddoan period include the T. M. Coles (41RR3), Boxed Springs (41UR30), and Hudnall-Pirtle (41RK4) mound centers on the Sabine and Sulphur rivers, and the George C. Davis site (41CE19) on the Neches River.

Caddo II Period

Arkansas

Haley Phase (A.D. 1200 - 1400)

The Haley Phase is the Caddo II Period equivalent for southwest Arkansas, although additional phases may be defined in the future. This phase is marked by the first appearance of temple mounds with structures on their summit, in contrast to featureless temple mounds of the Caddo I Period, in southwest Arkansas. Ceramic types of this phase include Haley Engraved, Handy Engraved, Hickory Engraved, Haley Complicated-Incised, Pease Brushed-Incised, and Sinner Linear Punctated. Significant sites of this phase include 3HE63 and 3MN53, the East site (3CL21), and 3GA1 (Schambach and Early 1982:107-109).

Louisiana

Bossier Focus (A.D. 1150 - 1550)

The Bossier Focus is equivalent to the Caddo II and III Periods of the Caddoan Culture Area. During this time period, mound construction and ritual ceremonialism appears to have declined significantly, indicating that ceremonialism played a much less prominent role in the lives of these people. This is reflected in the known ceremonial centers of this time period, such as Vanceville (16BO7), and Werner (16BO8) mounds, which were constructed on a smaller scale and contained much less elaborate material than the ceremonial centers of the preceding Alto Focus (Smith et al. 1983:213).

Not only is the ritual lifestyle less elaborate, but so are the artifacts recovered. Ceramics are no longer common-

ly engraved, incised, or punctated; rather, surface decoration involves a much heavier emphasis on brushing of body walls and/or rim, which is a decorative technique apparently derived from the Plaquemine culture to the east, in the Lower Mississippi River valley. There is also a noticeable lack of imported materials, indicating the trade networks are abandoned (Smith et al. 1983:214). According to the authors of *Louisiana's Comprehensive Archaeological Plan*,

. . . Caddo [Period] II and III, [in northwest Louisiana] represented by the Bossier Focus, was a time of decentralization and a return to a simpler lifestyle. Ceremonialism waned as settlements became more disperse. The Bossier Focus people carried on the Caddoan cultural tradition during Caddo II and III times in the northwestern part of the state, but were evidently content to remain outside the mainstream of the [Caddoan] cultural developments occurring [further north in Oklahoma] (Smith et al. 1983:214).

Oklahoma

Spiro Phase (A.D. 125 - 1400)

The preceding Harlan phase in the Arkansas Basin of Oklahoma overlaps into the tradition Caddo II Period, due to the lag time in the transmission of cultural aspects. Therefore, the Spiro phase is dated to begin in the latter part of the Caddo II Period and to continue to the end of the Caddo III Period. The key ceramic types of the Spiro phase are Woodward Applique, carinated bowls of Sanders

Engraved, and Poteau Engraved wares, with the domestic cooking ware being entirely shell-tempered. Significant sites of this phase are Norman, Cat Smith, Horton, Sheffield, Littlefield I, and Spiro.

In particular, the investigations of the Great Mortuary at Spiro produced a quantity of specialized ritual and mortuary ceramic, shell, and copper artifacts associated with the Southern Cult or Southern Ceremonial Complex (Brown et. al. 1978:173). The significant amount of elaborate ceremonial artifacts found in the Harlan Phase culture area would seem to indicate the mainstream of ceremonialism had passed northward from northwestern Louisiana into the northern part of the Caddoan Culture Area in the Caddo II Period.

Texas

Early Caddoan (A.D. 1000 - 1200)

There is a florescence of ceremonial behavior among the Caddo peoples between ca. A.D. 1000 - 1200. Both burial mounds and flat-topped platforms were constructed on Caddo ceremonial sites in Northeast Texas during this time period; the platforms sometimes served as bases for important public buildings and the houses of the elite, while in other times, important structures were ritually burned and covered over with an earth mound platform. Elite burials in mounds were commonly centrally placed in large and deep pits with multiple interments, and accompanied by exotic prestige goods. Ceramics associated with these ceremonial sites include Crockett Curvilinear Incised and Pennington Punctated-Incised, Williams Plain, various engraved fine

wares (such as Hickory Engraved and Holly Fine Engraved). Important ceremonial sites of the Early Caddoan age include the George C. Davis, Hudnall-Pirtle, and Hale sites.

Caddo III Period

This period, dating from ca. A.D. 1400 - 1500, is viewed as one where fundamental changes occurred in the socioreligious system of at least some Caddoan cultural groups. These changes are reflected in shifts in mortuary behavior, the structure of ceremonial centers, and in material culture assemblages in at least some of the regions of the Caddoan Culture Area (Schambach and Early 1982:112). However, this period remains for the most part a poorly defined period for the Caddoan Culture area.

For the states of Louisiana and Oklahoma, the Caddo III Period is simply viewed as an extension of the Bossier Focus and Harlan phase, respectively. In Arkansas, the dating of Caddo III Period sites is so uncertain that it does not have a focus or phase name. Ceramic types associated with the Caddo II Period (see above) appear to continue into the Caddo III Period. Only one site in Arkansas (3SA11) may reasonably be dated to the Caddo III Period.

Texas

Middle Caddoan (A.D. 1200 - 1400)

There is an intense Caddo settlement across Northeast Texas at this time, probably indicative of the success of a horticultural lifeway among the Caddo peoples in this region (Pertulla 1996:316).

Various lines of evidence indicate that maize and other domesticates became important and primary food resources across much of the Caddoan Culture Area. Burial mounds and temple mounds are well-distributed across the region, from the Red River in the Great Bend area to the Neches-Angelina river basins in deep East Texas. Important Middle Caddoan period ceremonial sites include Washington Square, Jamestown, T. M. Sanders, Fasken, Dan Holdeman, Coker, Bryan Hardy, McKenzie, and E. A. Roitsch (previously known as the Sam Kaufman site). Haley phase ceramics characterize the Middle Caddoan settlements and ceremonial sites on the lower Sulphur and in the Great Bend area, whereas farther up the Red River and in the upper Sulphur and Sabine river basins, ceramic types include Canton Incised, Sanders Engrave, Sanders Plain, and Maxey Noded Redware. Elsewhere, Middle Caddoan ceramics are much like those from the Bossier phase, and include more brushed utility wares as well as a diversity of engraved wares.

Caddo IV Period

The Caddo IV Period, generally dating from ca. A.D. 1500 - 1700 for the Caddoan Culture Area. This represents the period from sporadic contact between the Caddo and Euro-Americans, such as the de Soto expedition *entrada* into the Caddo area (1541 - 1542), to the establishment of permanent Spanish and French colonial settlements, such as the Arkansas Post, in Arkansas; Natchitoches, in Louisiana; and missions in Texas. According to the authors of the Arkansas State Plan,

The cultural effects of these early European contacts probably were not great, in the sense that few European goods found their way into Indian hands or significantly altered the Indian lifeways. The biological effects may have been more profound, however. It is probable that the Indians were afflicted with European diseases following contact with De Soto's army, and it is probable that as European contacts increased, and became prolonged towards the end of this period, these diseases began to take hold and spread, and Indian populations began their precipitous decline (Schambach and Early 1982:115).

Little research work has been accomplished for the Caddo IV Period. Although the late prehistoric Caddo culture appears to be in decline in much of Arkansas, there is a revitalization of Caddoan ceremonialism in Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma, reflecting either differences in cultural development throughout the Caddoan Culture Area or a general lack of research for this period.

Arkansas

Texarkana Phase (A.D. 1500 - 1700)

This phase, contemporary with the Belcher Focus in Louisiana (see below), and the Texarkana phase in Texas (see below), is restricted to the Great Bend Region of the Red River in Southwest Arkansas. Ceramic types for this phase in Arkansas are Avery Engraved, Barkman Engraved and Simms Engraved, Nash Neck Banded, and McKinney Plain. A

surface decoration of note on the ceramics is red slipping. Significant sites associated with this phase in Arkansas are Crenshaw (3MI6), Moore (3MI30), Foster (3LA27), Friday (3LA28), McClure (3MI29), and Battle Mound (3LA1) (Schambach and Early 1982:119).

Louisiana

Belcher Focus (A.D. 1500 - 1700)

This focus appears to represent a revitalization of ceremonialism from the preceding Bossier Focus of northwestern Louisiana. During this time period, there is return to the construction, in stages, of mounds which served as the foundations for religious structures and contained shaft burial pits. There is also a renewal of elaborate ritual offering for the high status dead. Among these artifacts are drinking cups, made of conch shells engraved with the serpent-eagle motif -- a common Southern Cult or Southern Ceremonial Complex representation; elaborate ceramic vessels of bird and animal effigies, return of engraved, incised, and punctated ceramic vessels, and surface decoration involving painting, brushing, and appliques; and ground stone objects. Many of the shell, ceramic, and stone artifacts were obtained through trade networks (Smith et. al. 1983:214-215).

Excavations at the Belcher Site (type site for this focus), reveals a new vitality in the ceremonial lifestyle of the Caddo people of northwest Louisiana. The evidence suggest this revitalization derived from contact with the Caddoan Culture Area of the north and the Mississippian Culture Area to the east (Smith et al. 1983:214).

Oklahoma

Fort Coffee Phase (A.D. 1400 - 1700)

This phase begins ca. A.D. 1400 and continues into the end of the Caddo V Period (ca. A.D. 1700). Key ceramic types of this phase are Avery Engraved, Braden Punctated, and Nash Banded. Significant sites of this phase are Harvey, Moore East, Tyler, Robinson-Solesbee, and Tyler-Rose (Brown et al. 1978:173).

Texas

Late Caddoan (A.D. 1400 - 1680)

Over much of Northeast Texas after about A.D. 1400 - 1500, with the exception mainly of the Red River valley, Caddo ceremonial mound centers were no longer being built and used by the Caddo in any numbers. Rather, large community cemeteries (some containing several hundred individuals) began to be used for the burial of the Caddo social elite (adult males) and individuals from surrounding and related Caddoan settlements (Perttula 1996:309). These elites were accompanied by many material goods, principally ceramic vessels, quivers of arrows, ceramic pipes, and groundstone celts, though rarely were grave goods made of exotic raw materials. Ceramics include those described above for the Texarkana phase, as well as Ripley Engraved, Taylor Engraved, Harleton Applique, Bullard Brushed, and Wilder Engraved for the Titus phase groups in the Sabine-Cypress drainage basins, and Poynor Engraved, Hume Engraved, Maydelle Incised, Killough Pinched, Bullard Brushed, and LaRue Neck Banded. Significant Late Caddoan period ceremonial sites include Hatchel-Mitchell, Cabe, A.C. Saunders, Pilgrim's, and Camp Joy mound centers,

as well as the Tuck Carpenter, H.R. Taylor, Pleasure Point, and Tracy community cemeteries.

Caddo V Period (Historic Contact Period)

The Caddo V Period marked the end of the nine hundred year Caddoan Tradition of mound building, under the direction of a chiefdom elite. This break with the past is undoubtedly due to the substantial population loss suffered by the Caddo through contact with Euro-American diseases. The loss of population transformed the Caddo from a primarily settled, horticultural society, to one which formed a strategic trading relationship with the Spanish and French colonists, in Texas and Louisiana, respectively. Sustained contacts and trade allowed the Caddo to acquire guns and horses, which they used in the procurement of buffalo hides, a primary item of trade with the colonists. Archeological investigations of Caddoan villages sites of this period are notable for the European trade items recovered in association with items of Caddoan material culture.

Arkansas

Chakanina Phase (A.D. 1700 - 1800)

Under pressure from Euro-American diseases and settlement, and from other Indian tribes, Caddo V occupation appears to be limited to the Great Bend area of the Red River in extreme southwest Arkansas. Diagnostic artifacts of the Caddo V Period in Arkansas are Keno Triled and Natchitoches Engraved ceramics, as well as European trade goods. Caddo V Period occupation is probably associated with the

Kadohadacho tribe of the Caddo. Significant sites associated with this period are Cedar Grove (3LA97) and the Friday site (Schambach and Early 1982:122-129).

Louisiana

Historic Contact (A.D. 1700 - 1835)

Sustained contact between the Caddo people and Euro-Americans begins ca. A.D. 1700 with the establishment of French and Spanish settlements in northwest Louisiana. The historic Caddo tribes of this area included the Kadohadacho (from which the term "Caddo" is derived), Ouachita, Natchitoches, Doustioni, Adaes, and Yatasi. By 1835, the majority of the Caddo population was removed to "Indian Territory" in present-day Oklahoma. Sites associated with the Caddo V Period are Fish Hatchery, Allen Plantation, and Drake's Saltworks (Smith et al. 1983:223-233).

Oklahoma

(See Fort Coffee phase in Caddo IV Period above.)

Texas

Historic Caddo (A.D. 1680 - 1859)

There is no archeological evidence that Caddo groups in Northeast Texas built mounds after about the mid-17th century (Perttula 1992). However, from ethno-historic accounts left by Spanish and French explorers and traders who visited Nasoni Caddo groups along the Red River in what is now Bowie County, Texas, the Caddo continued to use mounds as platforms for buildings used by important personages such as the *caddi* (see Wedel 1978). The mound at the Hatchel-Mitchell

site (41BW3) appears to be the ceremonial structure or *templo mayor* noted by the Spanish in 1691-1692, and the community includes the Eli Moores (41BW2), Hargrove Moores (41BW39), and Cabe (41BW14) sites. Other important Historic Caddo archeological sites in Northeast Texas include Deshazo, Clements, Allen, and Roseborough Lake, as well as Timber

Hill (41MR211, also known as Sha'chadinnih). In addition to European trade goods, key Historic Caddo material culture includes ceramics of the types Keno Trailed, Natchitoches Engraved, Foster Trailed-Incised, Simms Engraved, Patton Engraved, Emory Punctated-Incised, and Avery Engraved.

Important Categories of Information Known to Exist at Caddoan Ceremonial Sites (such as features and artifacts)

Caddoan ceremonial sites contain diverse sources of information from artifacts and features from three basic contexts: (a) the flat-topped platform mounds and the structures buried within and below them; (b) the burial mounds and associated burial tombs; and (c) the structures, features, and archeological deposits from any associated village areas.

The flat-topped platform mounds contain (either in and/or under the mound fill zones) preserved structures and interior features (postholes, pits, fires, etc.) documenting the character and planning of important public structures within the ceremonial sites, as well as the character and complexity of the structures used by the Caddo social elite. These are also informative in a comparative sense of the varying functions and hierarchies that may have existed between contemporaneous Caddoan ceremonial sites. Furthermore, the construction, use, destruction, and capping of these important structures with

mound fill, and the associated different colored soils and fills, represent a cycle of ritual activity and ceremony that is a basic part of Caddoan ceremonial behavior for many centuries.

The burial mounds and associated burial tombs represent unique categories of information concerning the nature of Caddoan mortuary practices at different times and places among the Caddoan people. From the construction of the mounds themselves, to the types of burials placed in the mounds, as well as the kinds and diversity of associated grave goods, and their associations with Caddo individuals of known age and sex, important information can be gained on change and continuity in mortuary behavior and ritual. The exotic grave goods are evidence for the existence of Caddoan long-distance trade and exchange networks, and the bioarcheological data from the burials is uniquely informative about changes in the health and diet of

different Caddoan groups.

Domestic village contexts on Caddoan ceremonial sites are marked by clusters of structures inhabited year-round, interior and extramural cooking and heating features, midden deposits, family cemeteries, and a diverse utilitarian assemblage of

lithic and bone tools and ceramic vessels. Information on changes in architectural detail, building size, spacing between buildings, and associated features (and their contents) provide insights into Caddoan social and economic trends at both the domestic and the ceremonial levels (see Rogers 1995).

Cultural and Environmental Influences on the Location and Distribution of Caddoan Mound Sites

The archeological evidence gathered since the early 1900s indicates that the largest Caddoan communities and the most significant civic-ceremonial centers (i.e., those with multiple platform mounds and burial mounds distributed around large plazas) were distributed rather regularly along the major streams, namely the Red (sites such as Battle, Crenshaw, Bowman, and Roitsch), Arkansas (includ-

ing the Spiro and Harlan centers), Little (the Clement site is one of the better known Caddoan mound centers in this river valley), Sabine (such as the Hudnall-Pirtle Site with eight mounds and a 60 acre village), and Ouachita rivers. These expansive riverine areas also had abundant natural resource and easily-worked arable soils, and appear to have had the highest population densities of Caddoan groups.

Research Questions that Could be Addressed by the Study of Caddoan Ceremonial Sites as derived from the Arkansas Archeological State Plan (Schambach and Early 1982), Louisiana Caddo Culture Historic Context (Smith et al. 1983), and the Texas Eastern Planning Region State Plan (Kenmotsu and Perttula 1993)

Settlement Systems

The following research designs address the character and nature of prehistoric Caddoan settlement systems during the time periods when the use of agricultural products intensified, and the possible

development of mutualistic relationships between sedentary populations and more mobile foragers existed within the Caddoan Culture Area. The State Planning documents of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas indicate a need for research ques-

tions to explore differences in settlement permanence and land use, origin and evolution of complex chiefdoms, community and household configurations, feature types, and the development of specialized storage facilities, such as:

- * The composition and internal organization of Caddoan ceremonial centers and their associated communities;
- * The recognition of different phases and clusters of Caddoan culture sites;
- * The implications of trail systems for the distribution of settlement and population clusters, and the location of major civic-ceremonial centers, where trails cross major streams and stream confluence areas;
- * The role, after ca. A.D. 1300, of droughts on the distribution of Caddoan settlements
- * The recognition of population movements and the colonization of Caddoan culture areas by Caddoan populations prior to A.D. 900;
- * The origin and evolution of complex chiefdom societies, e.g., the Caddoan chiefdoms.

Chronology and Typology

A well-developed chronological framework at both the local and regional scale within the Caddoan Culture Area would facilitate: (a) the consideration of diachronic and synchronic changes in the development of agriculture, the dating of

tropical and native cultigens adopted by Caddoan groups, and the establishment of temporal parameters for investigating the intensification of agricultural economies; (b) broad comparisons of Caddoan cultural history between the various subtraditions recognized in the Caddoan area; and (c) the formulation of local sequences, as well as typological constructs, that can be interpreted to have social meaning. Without an radiocarbon based absolute chronology it is difficult to assess the tempo of cultural changes, the adoption of domesticated plants, or the stylistic and functional parameters of extant ceramic and lithic typologies within the Caddoan Culture Area. Examples of research problems are listed below:

- * Refinements of the time span of various periods and defined phases;
- * Investigation of specific areas to determine why Caddoan occupations diminish after contact, e.g., Sulphur River basin, Texas;
- * Investigate regional variability in the continuity and intensity of Caddoan of occupations with the Caddoan cultural area;
- * Succession in occupation of certain major civic-ceremonial centers;
- * Determine chronological relationships of the phases and foci of various Caddoan culture areas, e.g., Alto and Sanders phases in the Sabine, Red, and upper Neches River basins, of Texas;

- * Identification of trade ceramics from the Mississippian area to the east after A.D. 800, e.g., Coles Creek ceramics in the Red, Sulphur, Cypress Creek and Sabine river basins;
- * Identification of key diagnostic artifacts to particular phases or foci of the Caddoan chronology.

Social and Political Organization

Observed changes in the social circumstances and complexity in the Caddoan Culture Area are important to consider in attempting to understand and explain changes in prehistoric Caddoan culture. Ceremonial and ritual activities at earthen mounds played a vital and expansive role in social and community integration as well as group decision-making. There appears to be a increase in the number of large-scale ceremonial sites concurrent with an elaboration of associated ceremonialism. This is believed to be part of an overall development of more complex and powerful systems of authority that could command Caddoan populations to construct and maintain these facilities. Issues and research questions include:

- * The importance of large-scale ceremonies and their associated symbolism in the development of the prehistoric Caddoan tradition between ca. A.D. 700 and 900;
- * The hierarchical arrangement of community mound centers, villages, hamlets, and farmsteads

in the Caddoan Culture Area, prior to A.D. 1400;

- * The nature of public architecture (e.g., elite residences on the top of pyramidal mounds, charnel houses, or other specific function public buildings) at the civic-ceremonial and multiple mound centers;
- * Changes in the complexity of social and political organization between ca. A.D. 1200 and A.D. 1400;
- * The significance of non-mound shaft tombs in certain areas of the Caddoan Culture area (Cypress and Sabine River Basins) ca. A.D. 1250 - 1600.

Subsistence Systems

An important research question is the types of strategies of subsistence resource utilization represented in the Caddoan Culture Area, between A.D. 800 to A.D. 1600. Researchers are interested in how the subsistence systems changed through time with the introduction and variable adoption of tropical domesticates and the domestication of native plants. The following research questions seek to develop a better understanding of how subsistence changes through time were expressed in other facts of Caddoan life in the region.

- * The introduction, use, and importance of domesticated plants at the local, basin-wide, and regions levels, and the shift to intensive maize agriculture;

- * The contribution of domesticated plants to the Caddoan diet before ca. A.D. 1200 in the Red and Upper Sabine River drainages;
- * The cultivation of native, seed-bearing plants, such as sumpweed, sunflower, knotweed, chenopod, maygrass, amaranth, and little barley, prior to A.D. 1400;
- * The exploitation of prairie animal species by the peoples of the western part of the Caddoan Culture Area;
- * The local and regional adaptive efficiency of Caddoan populations after A.D. 1200 as measured by bioarcheological indices, e.g., nutritional status, frequency of infectious diseases, and the mean age of death);
- * Diet in the Caddoan Culture Area, through the study of carbon isotope studies of human bone.

Demographic Change

Changes in population density and absolute sizes of communities and groups are important events in promoting structure and organizational changes in cultural systems. It is necessary to understand why prehistoric populations increased at certain times, the demographic structure and composition of communities and population groups, and how changes in population size and composition affected the sort and long-term nutrition and health of a population during periods of agricultural intensi-

fication. It would also be important to determine if there are significant trends in stress, diet, and health in Caddoan populations that evidence changes in the quality of life that correlated with the development of agricultural population. For example:

- * Identify demographic trends in individual drainage basins in the Caddoan Culture Area between A.D. 800 and A.D. 1600;
- * Determine the size of populations at households and communities prior to A.D. 1600;
- * Determine the causes of an apparent depopulation of some river basin (e.g., the upper Sulphur and upper Sabine River basins) after A.D. 1500.

Mortuary Practices

Caddoan mortuary practices are potentially quite informative about social differentiation and integration, corporate or group identities, territorial boundaries, ceremonialism, interregional relationship, and the development of political authority. The dating of Caddoan mortuary practices can provide information on the diachronic changes in the treatment of the dead. Such changes through time could be used to evaluate the significant social and cultural factors that could cause systemic changes in mortuary behavior. Examples of research questions include:

- * The complexity and significance of mortuary practices in the different

river basins of the Caddoan Culture Area through time;

- * The distribution of community cemeteries and the definition of the size and number of communities contributing to the cemeteries;
- * The use of earthen mounds for shaft burials and the internal relationship of shaft burials within such mounds;
- * The distribution and character of Formative and Early Caddoan Period burial and cemeteries.

Local and Extra-local Trade and Exchange

Within the Caddoan Culture Area the development of local and extra-local exchange and trade system are believed to serve to maintain social political relationships, provide means to obtain basic economic goods during years of lean crops, and provide a mechanism leading to the elaboration of ritual and religious ideology. Trade and exchange involving goods of economic and/or social significance may have contributed to community integration and fostered the development of sociopolitical entities that controlled and redistributed such goods. Research should concentrate on establishing the existence, size, and intensity of economic networks within the Caddoan Culture Area and other culture areas, and attempt to relate regional and/or temporal differences in such networks to the development of agricultural populations and social complexity in the region. Research areas include:

- * The regional, temporal, and spatial distribution, frequency, and context of long-distance trade goods such as copper, marine shell, and other items;
- * The interaction of hunter-gatherers and Caddoan agriculturalists after ca. A.D. 900, and the types of material traded between these groups;
- * Source areas for raw materials, e.g. pottery clays, and finished ceramics, through petrographic, geochemical, and mineralogical analysis, to establish the existence, size, intensity, and relative amount of goods traded in Early to Late Caddoan Period economic networks;
- * Examination of stylistic parameters in ceramic, lithic, and groundstone artifacts, artifact attributes, and elements of design from sites within the Late Caddoan Period.

Technological Change

Research would investigate changes in artifacts, dwellings, and storage features that may have occurred as a consequence of sedentary life and the adoption of food production systems. Basic questions that could be considered would include:

- * Technological changes that occurred in the types of artifacts and facilities used by populations involved in agriculture;
- * The nature of the social and economic demands on such communities,

and what types of restructuring (if any) in labor and energy expenditures are evidenced in the archeological record;

- * In particular, research should concentrate on technological changes, such as construction of structural architecture, the adoption of the bow and arrow, the occurrence of specialized storage features, and development of bipolar lithic industries.

Material Culture

Material culture addresses specific artifacts recovered from the archeological record, such as ceramics, ornaments, projectile points, and stone tools, and seeks to determine how and why particular temporal, functional, regional, systemic changes in the Caddoan lifeways are expressed in the material culture assemblages of the Caddoan people. Research questions that could be explored include:

- * Develop ceramic indicators of group boundaries throughout the Caddoan Culture Area;
- * Projectile point stylistic variability and geographic, temporal, and social associations/distributions;
- * Functional and stylistic parameters of antler, bone, and shell technologies in the Caddoan Culture Area.

Ethnohistoric Changes

The effects of European contact and European-introduced diseases on Caddoan populations played a significant role in

changing the health, community size, and overall population of the Caddo. Important changes from the Late Caddoan Period into the Historic Period (ca. A.D. 1500 - 1840) must be addressed when considering the sociopolitical cohesion, health of the group, and their adjustment to other tribes and Euro-American groups. Research questions are noted below:

- * Identify the timing and magnitude of population declines in Caddoan groups caused by the introduction of European epidemic diseases, throughout the Caddoan Culture Area;
- * Identify through the bioarcheological record the consequences of Euro-American contact, specifically demographic decline, stress, and health status through diseases, and mortality problems caused by conflicts with Immigrant Tribes and Euro-Americans;
- * Identify regional or temporal changes in mortuary practices, sociopolitical complexity, and mound building following the introduction of new diseases that may indicate significant changes in Caddoan ideology and ceremonial activities;
- * Identify changes in Caddoan religion through influences of Christianity and other Historic Tribes;
- * Identify changes in the sociopolitical organization of the Caddo from the Late Prehistoric through the Historic Period through interaction

with Euro-Americans and other
Historic Tribes;

- * Identify the character of changes in
Caddoan settlement, subsistence,
and economic systems after
contact with Euro-Americans and

other Historic Tribes;

- * Identify the character of changes in the
Caddoan artifacts, technology, and
trade and exchange systems after
contact with Euro-Americans and
other Historic Tribes.

Caddoan Ceremonial Sites and Their Relation to Important Archeological Research and its Association with the National Historic Landmark Thematic Framework

Mound Ceremonialism in Caddo Culture and Caddoan Mythology and its Relations to Mound Sites

Caddoan civic-ceremonial centers were marked by the construction of earthen mounds that were used as temples, burial mounds, and ceremonial fire mounds for civic and/or religious functions (Jeter et al. 1989; Story 1990). Schambach (1996) suggest that the Caddoan mound-building tradition began as a burial mound tradition in the Woodland Fourche Maline period along the Red River (perhaps between A.D. 600 - 900), and that the first construction of flat-topped temple mounds dates several hundred years later (perhaps as late as A.D. 1250 in southwestern Arkansas). Elsewhere in the Caddoan area, however, the flat-topped platform mounds began to be constructed perhaps as early as A.D. 1000 or so. At Spiro in the north Caddoan area, the Brown and Copple platform mounds were constructed during the Harlan phase (ca. A.D. 1000 - 1250), which is contemporaneous with the Mound A and B platforms at the George

C. Davis Site, far to the south in deep East Texas.

The mound centers used by Caddoan groups up to A.D. 1700 (at least along the Red River at the Hatchel Site) probably represent the "social and economic focal point of local polities" (Rogers 1996:5). These mound centers were places where sacred rites could be performed, where ritual paraphernalia was stored, and where the important and elite members of Caddoan society congregated to discuss religious, political, and tribal matters. The civic-ceremonial centers also played special mortuary roles in prehistoric and protohistoric Caddoan polities. The social and political elite were frequently buried in shaft tombs placed in the earthen mounds, and they were accompanied by many elaborately made grave goods. These grave goods had limited intra-societal distributions, were made frequently on non-local materials obtained from great distances (such as copper and conch shell) and usually were obtained through long-distance trade networks.

While elite Caddo burials in mounds were commonly centrally placed in large and deep grave pits with multiple interments (some being retainer burials), or were placed in (or under) the central area of the mound, the social commoners were buried in family and village cemeteries near the houses they lived in (or in the case of children, buried under the floor of the house). They were probably accompanied by the same rituals and ceremonies as the elites, "but without so much pomp" (Carter 1995:88).

The prehistoric archeological record documents substantial changes in Caddoan sociopolitical and ceremonial activities over the period from ca. A.D. 800 to European contact. In general, the change is principally from the development of ranked societies between A.D. 700-900 and ca. A.D. 1400-1500, to a more egalitarian sociopolitical system where mound centers were no longer constructed and used, long-distance trade efforts diminished, and elaborate mortuary ceremonialism associated with mounds ceased to flourish.

Although Caddoan peoples no longer constructed mounds after about A.D. 1700, this does not mean that their ceremonial beliefs associated with them were lost and traditions discontinued concerning the cultural importance of the mounds. Caddoan folklore indicates that the custom of weeping on greeting each other may be related to those past times when Caddoan peoples came together at the civic-ceremonial mound centers.

"Cha-cah-nee-nah," or the Place of

Crying, is associated with the Caddoan origin myths (Mooney 1896; Newkumet and Meredith 1988:112), to the earth itself, as well as to the sacred hills along the Red River, and thus the word appears to be a general Caddoan term symbolizing all ceremonial mound centers (Schambach 1989:30, note 9). It is surely significant that the Battle Mound, at 205 m in length and 98 m in width, and 10.4 m in height -- the largest known Caddoan mound and one of the larger platform mounds in the Southeastern United States -- stands on modern Chichaninny Prairie, a name clearly derived from the Caddo word "Cha-cah-nee-nah".

Registration Requirements

In order for a Caddoan Ceremonial Mound Site to be considered for inclusion in this multiple resource nomination, the property must demonstrate the following three components:

1. The property must contain a mound or complex of mounds. Associated habitation sites should be included in the boundaries.
2. The property must be shown from archeological investigations to date to the appropriate Caddo I to Caddo IV time period and contain appropriate artifacts of that period, i.e., radiocarbon dates and/or datable ceramic or other artifacts.
3. The archeological property must have a high degree of integrity. That is, archeological investigations should be able to

demonstrate the site has potential for providing information on research topics identified in this multiple resource nomination.

Geographical Data

As noted above, archeological investigations have demonstrated that the distribution of Caddoan ceremonial mound sites is limited to the Red, Ouachita, and Arkansas River Basins in southwest Arkansas, northcentral and northwest Louisiana, eastern Oklahoma, and northeastern Texas. Construction of these ceremonial mound centers found in the Caddoan Culture Area commenced ca. A.D. 800 and ended ca. A.D. 1700.

Throughout the nine hundred years these mound centers were constructed they became increasingly larger and more complex, under the apparent direction of a Caddoan chiefdom elite. Within the Caddoan Culture Area there was not a lineal progression of the construction of ceremonial mound centers. There were periods of time throughout the Caddo I to IV period when mound building activities intensified or ceased, possibly due to disruptions of the horticultural or sociopolitical base of the Caddoan chiefs within the various river basins. Other factors which affect the known distribution and preservation of Caddoan ceremonial centers are vandalism and modern development, both of which have destroyed a substantial number of mound centers.

Table 1. Listing of Significant Caddoan Ceremonial Sites from the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Site Name	Site Number	NRHP Status
ARKANSAS		
Crenshaw site	3MI6	Listed on Register
Bowman site	3LR46	
3MN53	3MN53	
3HE63	3HE63	
Moore	3MI30	
Foster	3LA27	
Friday	3LA28	
McClure	3MI2	
Battle Mound	3LA1	
Cox site	3LA18	
Cedar Grove	3LA97	
Spirit Lake	3LA83	
Gum Point	3LA87	
Hindman Mound Group	3OU20	
LOUISIANA		
Gahagan site	16RR1	
Mounds Plantation	16CD12	
Vanceville site	16BO7	
Werner Mounds	16BO8	
Belcher site	16CD13	
Pace site	16DS289	
OKLAHOMA		
Harlan site	34CK6	
Spiro site	34LF46	

Table 1 (continued). Listing of Significant Caddoan Ceremonial Sites from the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Site Name	Site Number	NRHP Status
<i>OKLAHOMA (continued)</i>		
Grobin Davis Mounds	34MC253	Eligible
Harvey site	34SQ18	
Moore East site	34LF31	
Tyler site	34HS11	
Tyler-Rose site	34HS20	
Brackett site	34CK43	
Eufaula site	34MI45	
Norman site	34WG2	
Cat Smith site	34MS52	
Horton site	34SQ11	
Sheffield site	34SQ22	
Littlefield I site	34LF60	
Roden/Lindley sites	34MC689/705/706	Eligible
McKinney (A.W. Davis) Mound sites	34MC6	Eligible
Baldwin Mound site	34MC140	Eligible
Young Lake site	34MC287	Eligible
Bud Wright site	34MC216	Eligible
Pine Creek Mound site	34MC146	Eligible
<i>TEXAS</i>		
George C. Davis site	41CE19	Listed in Register 11/15/79
Hatchel-Mitchell-Moores Complex	41BW3/4/7/169/226	Listed in Register
Pace McDonald site	41AN51	Listed in Register 8/12/82
Hudnall-Pirtle	41RK4	Listed in Register
Eli Moores site	41BW2	Listed in Register

Table 1 (continued). Listing of Significant Caddoan Ceremonial Sites from the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Site Name	Site Number	NRHP Status
Cabe site	34BW14	
Washington Square site	41NA49	
E.A. Roitsch site	41RR16	
Jamestown site	41SM54	
Boxed Springs site	41UR30	
Pilgrim's site	41CP304	Eligible
Gus Jones site	41HS15	
T.M. Sanders site	41LR2	
A.C. Mackin site	41LR39	Listed in Register
Fasken site	41RR14	Listed in Register
Wright site	41RR7	Listed in Register
Rowland Clark site	41RR77	
Dan Holdeman site	41RR11	
Hale site	41TT12	Listed in Register
Camp Joy site	41UR144	
Coker site	41CS1	
T.M. Coles site	41RR3	
T.S. Montgomery site	41CS4	
Westerman site	41HO15	Listed in Register
Hargrave Moores site	41BW39	Listed in Register
Davis-McPeak site	41UR4/99	
Colony Church site	41RA31	
Cox site	41WD349	
Bryan Hardy site	41SM55	
Fruitvale site	41VN35	
McKenzie site	41WD55	

Bibliographical References

- Brown, James A., Robert E. Bell, and Don G. Wyckoff
1978 Caddoan Settlement Patterns in the Arkansas River Drainage. In *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, pp. 169-200, edited by B. Smith. Academic Press, New York.
- Carter, Cecile E.
1995 *Caddo Indians, Where We Come From*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Jeter, M.D., J.C. Rose, G.I. Williams, and A.M. Harmon
1989 *Archaeology and Bioarchaeology of the Lower Mississippi Valley and the Trans-Mississippi South in Arkansas and Louisiana*. Research Series No. 37. Arkansas Archaeological Survey, Fayetteville.
- Kenmotsu, Nancy A., and Timothy K. Perttula (Editors)
1993 *Archaeology in the Eastern Planning Region, Texas: A Planning Document*. Department of Antiquities Protection, Cultural Resource Management Report 3, Texas Historical Commission, Austin.
- Mooney, J.
1896 The Ghost Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890. *Fourteenth annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, Part 2, pp. 641-1110.
- Newkumet, V.B., and H.L. Meredith
1988 *Hasinai: A Traditional History of the Caddo Confederacy*. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, Texas.
- Perttula, Timothy K.
1992 "*The Caddo Nation*," *Archaeological and Ethnohistoric Perspectives*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- 1996 Caddoan Area Archaeology Since 1990. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 4(4):295-348.
- Rogers, J.D.
1995 Dispersed Communities and Integrated Households: A Perspective from Spiro and the Arkansas Basin. In *Mississippian Communities and Households*, edited by J. D. Rogers and B. D. Smith, pp. 81-98. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- 1996 The Caddos. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Southeast Volume. Smithsonian Press, Washington, D.C. (in press).
- Saunders, Joseph, and T. Allen
1994 Hedgepeth Mounds: An Archaic Mound Complex in North-central Louisiana. *American Antiquity* 59(3):471-489.
- Schambach, Frank F.
1989 The End of the Trail: The Route of

- Hernando De Soto's Army through Southwest Arkansas and East Texas. *The Arkansas Archaeologist* 27/28:9-33.
- 1996 Mounds, Embankments, and Ceremonialism in the Trans-Mississippi South. In *Mounds, Embankments, and Ceremonialism in the Midsouth*, edited by R. C. Mainfort and R. Walling, pp. 36-43. Research Series No. 46. Arkansas Archeological Survey, Fayetteville.
- 1997 The Development of the Burial Mound Tradition in the Caddo Area. *Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology* 9:53-72.
- 1998 *Pre-Caddoan Cultures in the Trans-Mississippi South*. Research Series No. 53. Arkansas Archeological Survey, Fayetteville.
- Schambach, Frank F., and Ann M. Early
1982 Southwest Arkansas. In *A State Plan for the Conservation of Archeological Resources in Arkansas*, edited by H.A. Davis. Arkansas Archeological Survey of Research Series 21, Fayetteville, Arkansas
- Smith, Steve D., Philip G. Rivet, Kathleen M. Byrd, and Nancy W. Hawkins
1983 *Louisiana's Comprehensive Archaeological Plan*. Published by the Division of Archaeology, Office of Cultural Development, Baton Rouge.
- Story, Dee Ann
1990 Culture History of the Native Americans. In *The Archaeology and Bioarchaeology of the Gulf Coastal Plain*, by D.A. Story, J.A. Guy, B.A. Burnett, J.C. Rose, M.D. Freeman, D.G. Steele, K.J. Reinhard, and B.W. Olive, pp. 163-366. 2 Volumes. Research Series No. 38. Arkansas Archeological Survey, Fayetteville.
- Wedel, M.M.
1978 *LaHarpe's 1719 Post on Red River and Nearby Caddo Settlements*. Bulletin 30. Texas Memorial Museum, The University of Texas at Austin.